REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed October 24, 2005. Claims 1-29 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

1. ### Response To Rejections of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-10, 13-15, and 18-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Ling* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059192 A1). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed subject matter must be represented in the applied reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). In the present case, not every feature of the claimed subject matter is represented in the *Ling* reference. Applicant discusses the *Ling* reference and Applicant's claims in the following.

a. ### Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicant claims:

> A method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:
> receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponds to a resource;
> *soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid;*
> receiving input of said search terms;
> searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said search terms;
> presenting a list of all valid RLs in said predetermined index that correspond to said search terms;
> receiving selection of a RL from said list; and
> retrieving and displaying content from said selected RL

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ling* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of "soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid," as recited and emphasized above in claim 1.

Rather, *Ling* discloses at most a system where:

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

6

the user would enter the request string in the address line of the browser being used. The browser would then attempt to access the page of the web-site specified by the request string, but as the page address is invalid overall, an error message is generated. This error message is then trapped. . . . Trapping of the error message initiates the completion of the remaining procedure steps[, where] the results are then displayed in the browser that the user is utilising. In this way, a user will need only to enter the requested string and then await the return of the duly processed results.

Paragraph 0027 (Emphasis added). Thus, *Ling* fails to disclose the step of "soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid," since *Ling* teaches that search terms are inputted without solicitation. For example, *Ling* clearly describes a system where a user inputs search terms in an "address bar" that is requesting address information which then causes an "error message" to be generated that is "trapped" and prevented from being received by the browser. As such, the address bar of the browser is clearly requesting address information and not search terms. Therefore, *Ling* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 1, such as soliciting input of search terms.

Further, the claim has been amended to feature the step of "soliciting input of search terms if said RL is invalid" to further distinguish the claimed subject matter from the cited reference. This amended feature was also referenced in the Office Action.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Ling*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

b.   Claims 2-7

Because independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 2-7 (which depend from independent claim 1) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 2-7 contain all the steps and features of independent claim 1. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 2-7 should be withdrawn.

c.   Claim 8

As provided in independent claim 8, Applicant claims:

A method of accessing a resource associated with a resource locator
(RL) comprising the steps of:
receiving input of a RL, said RL corresponding to a resource;
determining if said RL is valid;
soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid;
receiving input of said RL search string; and

7

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

> searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said
> RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet criteria specified by said RL
> search string.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 8 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ling* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of "soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid," as recited and emphasized above in claim 8.

Rather, *Ling* discloses at most a system where:

> the user would enter the request string in the address line of the browser being used. The browser would then attempt to access the page of the web-site specified by the request string, but as the page address is invalid overall, an error message is generated. This error message is then trapped. . . . Trapping of the error message initiates the completion of the remaining procedure steps[, where] the results are then displayed in the browser that the user is utilising. In this way, a user will need only to enter the requested string and then await the return of the duly processed results.

Paragraph 0027 (Emphasis added). Thus, *Ling* fails to disclose the step of "soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid," since *Ling* teaches that search terms are inputted without solicitation. For example, *Ling* clearly describes a system where a user inputs search terms in an "address bar" that is requesting address information which then causes an "error message" to be generated that is "trapped" and prevented from being received by the browser. As such, the address bar of the browser is clearly requesting address information and not search terms. Therefore, *Ling* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 8.

Further, the claim has been amended to feature the step of "soliciting input of a RL search string if said RL is invalid" to further distinguish the claimed subject matter from the cited reference. This feature was also referenced in the Office Action.

Therefore, *Ling* does not teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 is not anticipated by *Ling*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

d.   **Claims 9-10**

Because independent claim 8 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 9-10 (which depend from independent claim 8) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 9-10 contain all the steps and features of

8   **BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

independent claim 8. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 9-10 should be withdrawn.

e. **Claim 13**

As provided in independent claim 13, Applicant claims:

A method of selecting a resource locator (RL) comprising the steps of:

receiving input of a RL at a user device, said RL corresponding to a resource;
determining if said RL is valid;
generating a RL search string at the user device if said RL is invalid; and

searching a predetermined index of valid RLs in accordance with said RL search string to determine valid RLs that meet the criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 13 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ling* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "receiving input of a RL at a user device, said RL corresponding to a resource," "determining if said RL is valid," and "generating a RL search string at the user device if said RL is invalid," as recited and emphasized above in claim 13.

Ling fails to teach or suggest "receiving input of a RL at a user device, said RL corresponding to a resource," "determining if said RL is valid," and "generating a RL search string at the user device if said RL is invalid," since *Ling* teaches that an error message for an invalid address is trapped before being received by a user's web browser and a search string is formed at a remote server. *See, e.g.,* paragraphs 42 and 53. Thus, *Ling* fails to teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 13. Therefore, claim 13 is not anticipated by *Ling*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

f. **Claims 14-15**

Because independent claim 13 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 14-15 (which depend from independent claim 13) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 14-15 contain all the steps and features of

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

9

independent claim 13. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 14-15 should be withdrawn.

g.   Claim 18

As provided in independent claim 18, Applicant claims:

> A system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising:
> *controller for receiving a RL search string from a user device, wherein said RL search string is generated at the user device based upon an invalid RL that was provided as input to the user device;*
> memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs; and
> said controller is further configured to search said list of valid RLs to determine valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 18 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ling* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least the feature of a "controller for receiving a RL search string from a user device, wherein said RL search string is generated at the user device based upon an invalid RL that was provided as input to the user device," as recited and emphasized above in claim 18.

Ling fails to teach or suggest a "controller for receiving a RL search string from a user device, wherein said RL search string is generated at the user device based upon an invalid RL that was provided as input to the user device," since *Ling* teaches that an error message for an invalid address is trapped before being received by a user's web browser and a search string is formed at a remote server where the search is performed. *See, e.g.,* paragraphs 42-43 and 53. Thus, *Ling* fails to teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 is not anticipated by *Ling,* and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

h.   Claims 19-23

Because independent claim 18 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 19-23 (which depend from independent claim 13) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 19-23 contain all the elements and features of

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

10

independent claim 18. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 19-23 should be withdrawn.

i.   Claim 24

As provided in independent claim 24, Applicant claims:

> A system for accessing a resource associated with a resource locator (RL) comprising:
> controller for receiving a RL from a user device;
> *memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs at the user device;*
> *said controller is configured to generate a RL search string if said RL is determined to be invalid;* and
> said RL search string comprises a wildcard, wherein said RL search term describes a name of a location for a desired resource and said valid RLs have names that correspond to said RL search string.

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 24 is allowable for at least the reason that *Ling* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs at the user device" and "said controller is configured to generate a RL search string if said RL is determined to be invalid," as recited and emphasized above in claim 24.

Ling fails to teach or suggest "memory associated with said controller for storing a list of valid RLs at the user device" and "said controller is configured to generate a RL search string if said RL is determined to be invalid," since *Ling* teaches that an error message for an invalid address is trapped before being received by a user's web browser and a search string is formed at a remote server where the search is performed. *See, e.g.,* paragraphs 42-43 and 53. Thus, *Ling* fails to teach or suggest at least all of the claimed features of claim 24. Therefore, claim 24 is not anticipated by *Ling*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least this reason alone.

j.   Claims 25-29

Because independent claim 24 is allowable over the cited art of record, dependent claims 25-29 (which depend from independent claim 24) are allowable as a matter of law for at least the reason that the dependent claims 25-29 contain all the elements and features of

11

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

independent claim 24. For at least this reason, the rejections of claims 25-29 should be withdrawn.

2. __Response To Rejections of Claims 11-12 and 16-17 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)__

Claims 11-12 and 16-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ling*. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant submits that *Ling* does not teach or suggests all of the claimed features of independent claims 8 and 13, as previously discussed. Further, the Office Action fails to introduce and cite art that cures the deficiencies of the *Ling* reference. Thus, claims 11-12 and 16-17 (which depend from respective independent claims 8 and 13) are allowable over *Ling* for at least this reason.

The Office Action states that claims 11-12 and 16-17 were rejected using well-known knowledge or facts in the art. However, Applicant fails to ascertain where this assertion was made in the Office Action. Rather, the Office Action states with regard to claims 11-12 that "it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that a person who queries a search engine is not only interested in the search report itself, but also interested in what further content the search report brings forth. That is, it is obvious that Ling's search report is associated with various URLs, on which the user may selectively click and obtain further content from the selected URL."

In response, Applicant respectfully submits that the steps of "receiving a selection of a RL specified by said list of valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string" and "accessing and displaying content from a resource associated with said selected RL," as recited in claims 11-12, is not obvious within the context of the subject matter of the claim that also includes the features of the base claims. Applicant generally proposes the notion that a feature in one context may not be obvious in another context. Further, there are distinctions between "receiving a selection of a RL specified by said list of valid RLs that meet criteria of said RL search string" and "accessing and displaying content from a resource associated with said selected RL" and "a person who queries a search engine [that] is not only interested in the search report itself, but also interested in what further content the search report brings forth." For at least these reasons, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Application Serial No.: 10/047,629
Art Unit: 2154

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

13